

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Witek.

SENATOR WITEK: Thank you. I'm again going to draw your attention to, and the...what the...I keep talking about the Program Evaluation Committee's document for the Nebraska Equal Opportunity Commission, that was given to us in January of last year. I think we received it after that, but it gives a...on page 9 of the part 2 it talks about the recommendations from the Program Evaluation Committee and the rebuttal response from the commission. If you don't do anything else as far as looking into this, this is what you should read is right here because it gives both sides of kind of the intense look into the EEOC. And it was very interesting and eye-opening to me to read both sides because they are very diverse in how they feel about certain issues. That alone...I understand that there seems to be some problems within the commission itself. They're taking on a tremendous task, it's grown extensively since the 1960's, when it started I think it went from 15 to over 1,600 cases a year. That's a big workload. You've got 37 people in there. You've got over a million and a half dollars a year allocated, it's a big group of people and it's a lot...a lot to keep track of. So, maybe there are some problems. But if we looked at any other area of government with approximately that amount of people and that size budget I would not hesitate to say I believe that there would be problems within those agencies, too. And those agencies maybe are not even of the same nature as the EEOC, which is a mediation agency, it's not a service agency, it's a mediation agency. That's why if you're going to look at this agency, and why are we looking at this agency anyway? Why was it the one picked? Why was it the one...you know, why are...we keep hearing about this stuff, you know, coming from the Governor's Office every so often on what's happening with the two employees and all this other stuff that's kind of been happening at the same time that we're looking at this agency. It all seems rather set up to me. But you're looking at this agency, first of all, to make it better. That's what I thought this evaluation was supposed to be, to improve the agency, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness. If you're making it better, how is doing away with the entire commission that operates it and the director with this Section 21 going to improve that? To me it will be an extremely disruptive, extremely disruptive to an agency that has already gone through continually disruptive acts for the last two years or three